

## REMARKS

### **A. Request for Reconsideration**

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action dated March 17, 2009 but remain of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the above amendments to the specification, amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

### **B. Claim Status**

Claims 12-17 and 22-31 are pending in this Application, claim 12 has been amended, claims 22-31 have been added, and claims 1-11 and 18-21 have been cancelled herein.

Claim 12 has been amended herein, to recite the limitations of originally filed claim 1.

New claims 22-31 have been added to recite limitations previously recited in originally filed claims 2-11.

Respectfully, no new matter has been added herein.

**C. Specification Amendments**

The specification has been amended to correct the legend on page 110 below Table 2. Specifically, the "\*" symbol indicates Transparent conductive films wherein softening and deformation occurred during the thermal shock cycle and that moisture permeability was unsuccessful. As noted in Table 2, the samples in which moisture permeability was unsuccessful, were actually transparent conductive films 206, 222 and 223, not 219 and 220 as previously indicated in the legend.

Respectfully, no new matter has been added.

**D. Prior Art Rejection**

The Examiner made the following four prior art rejections:

(1) Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Yamada (U.S. 2002/0123209) in view of Machell (U.S. 5,219,510);

(2) Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Yamada, Machell, and Kakinuma (U.S. 5,840,465);

(3) Claim 10 is rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Yamada, Machell, and Ota (U.S. 6,866,949); and

(4) Claims 19-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over a combination Yamada, Machell and Gotoh (U.S. 5,820,994).

At the outset, Applicants note that the Examiner did not reject claim 1 or claim 12 in rejections (2)-(4) above. Thus, in light of amending claim 12 to include the limitations of claim 1, rejections (2)-(4) above are now moot.

Turning to rejection (1), Yamada had been cited to teach a display substrate substantially as claimed. The Examiner recognized that Yamada does not teach stretching in the conveyance direction and cited Machell which teaches stretching in the conveyance direction as well as in the lateral direction. However, Applicants note that neither reference teaches the criticality of the claimed combination of stretching in both the conveyance direction and the lateral direction and having a small amount of plasticizer. In contrast, the claimed invention requires the claimed combination of a plasticizer in an amount of less than 1 percent, wherein the transparent film is drawn 3 through 100 percent both in a conveyance direction and a lateral direction. In fact, claim 12 has been amended to more particularly recite this novel aspect of the invention.

Moreover, Tables 1 and 2 on pages 104 and 110, respectively, of the present application demonstrate the criticality of the claimed combination. Transparent conductive film 206 was not prepared in accordance with the claimed invention. Transparent conductive film 206 was prepared with a

substrate film composition 106 that was stretched within the claimed range, but employed an amount of plasticizer outside of the claimed range. Transparent conductive film 219 was also not prepared in accordance with the claimed invention. Transparent conductive film 219 was prepared with a substrate film composition 119 that was not stretched, and contained no plasticizer. Transparent conductive films 204 and 205 were prepared in accordance with the claimed invention. Both substrate film compositions 104 and 105, respectively, were stretched within the claimed range, and both substrate film compositions 104 and 105 employed a plasticizer amount within the claimed range. As shown in Table 2, each of the transparent conductive films had approximately the same initial moisture permeability. However, after thermal shock cycle, the moisture permeability was unacceptable in transparent conductive films 206 and 219, which did not employ the claimed combination. On the other hand, the transparent conductive films 204 and 205 which employed the claimed combination provided surprisingly superior moisture permeability compared to transparent conductive films 206 and 219. Specifically, the moisture permeability of transparent conductive films 204 and 205 was two to three times less than the moisture permeability of transparent conductive film 219. The moisture permeability of

transparent conductive film 206 could not even be determined because the moisture permeability after the thermal shock cycle resulted in softening and deformation of the film. Thus, the data presented in Tables 1 and 2 show the superior moisture permeability of a transparent conductive film having the claimed combination of a plasticizer in an amount of less than 1 percent, wherein the transparent film is drawn 3 through 100 percent both in a conveyance direction and a lateral direction.

Since neither Yamada nor Machell, either alone or in combination, teach a display substrate with the claimed combination of a plasticizer in an amount of less than 1 percent, wherein the transparent film is drawn 3 through 100 percent both in a conveyance direction and a lateral direction, it is respectfully submitted that the claims presented herein are patentable over the Examiner's rejections.

#### E. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this Application in

pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas  
Donald C. Lucas, Reg. #31,275  
Attorney for Applicants  
475 Park Avenue South  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel. 212-661-8000

DCL/CMJ/mr